

AS



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,649	11/09/2001	Jeffrey Oliver	100.338US01	7338
34206	7590	02/10/2005	EXAMINER	
FOGG AND ASSOCIATES, LLC P.O. BOX 581339 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458-1339			SHIN, KYUNG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/008,649

Applicant(s)

OLIVER ET AL.

Examiner

Kyung H Shin

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/24/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed 11/9/2001
2. Claims 1 - 16 are pending. Independent claims are 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 - 11, 13, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Miller (US Patent No. 5,511,067).

Regarding Claim 1, Miller discloses an architecture for a telecommunications device (see Miller col. 1, lines 7-10: telecommunications system), comprising:

- a) a plurality of operational modules; (see Miller col. 12, lines 43-45; col. 21, lines 45-48: multiple support (operational) modules for applications) and
- b) a plurality of application interfaces (API), each API providing functionality for one of the plurality of operational modules, wherein each API is broadly defined to allow operation of multiple driver sets depending upon a desired driver for the

system. (see Miller col. 12, lines 39-45: operational modules for applications; modules controlled by drivers)

Regarding Claims 2, 5, Miller discloses the architecture of claims 1, 3, wherein at least one of the plurality of interfaces supports a plurality of different drivers, and wherein the at least one of the plurality of interfaces comprises:

- a) a first portion of information common to each of the plurality of different drivers; (see Miller col. 14, lines 34-37: information common to device driver) and
- b) a second portion of information specific to one of the plurality of different drivers. (see Miller col. 18, lines 9-18: information specific to particular device driver)

Regarding Claim 3, Miller discloses an architecture for a telecommunications transport device, comprising:

- a) an application layer; (see Miller col. 12, lines 39-41: types of application layers)
- b) a framework layer; (see Miller col. 13, lines 31-37: control (framework) layer)
- c) a hardware driver layer; (see Miller col. 12, lines 43-45: device (hardware) driver layer) and
- d) a plurality of interfaces, an interface between each layer and each other layer, the plurality of interfaces providing interaction between the layers. (see Miller col. 11, lines 24-27: interface between each layer controlled by transfer of messaging data and user data)

Regarding Claim 4, Miller discloses the architecture of claim 3, wherein each of the plurality of interfaces supports a broadly defined set of operations within a predefined

Art Unit: 2143

category of operations. (see Miller col. 14, lines 3-10: forward and reverse (categories) application layers)

Regarding Claim 6, Miller discloses an architecture for a telecommunications device, comprising:

- a) an application layer; (see Miller col. 12, lines 39-41: types of application layers)
- b) a framework layer; (see Miller col. 13, lines 31-37: control (framework) layer) and
- c) a hardware layer (see Miller col. 12, lines 43-45: device (hardware) driver layer),
the layers connected through a plurality of interfaces between each layer and each other layer, (see Miller col. 11, lines 24-27: interface between each layer for control by transfer of messaging data and user data) wherein the architecture further comprises:
 - d) a plurality of modules, each module capable of performing a function of the system. (see Miller col. 10, line 66 - col. 11, line 2; col. 21, lines 45-48: each layer capable of multiple functions)

Regarding Claim 7, Miller discloses a modular architecture for a telecommunications system, comprising: a plurality of function modules, each function module supported by a driver set; and a plurality of application interfaces, each application interface broadly defined to support the driver set for its respective function module. (see Miller col. 10, line 66 - col. 11, line 2; col. 12, lines 41-45; col. 18, lines 9-12: applications - multiple functions - drivers)

Regarding Claim 8, Miller discloses a method for defining a telecommunications system architecture, comprising:

- a) defining a plurality of driver sets, a driver set for each of a plurality of functions of the system, each of the plurality of driver sets supporting at least one driver for a respective function module; (see Miller col. 17, lines 58-60: set of drivers)
- b) selecting a subset of the plurality of system functions; (see Miller col. 17, line 58 - col. 18, line 8: specific driver for specific function) and
- c) applying one of the at least one driver of each driver set to its respective function module through an application interface layer between the driver and the function module. (see Miller col. 18, lines 12-18: interface applications to drivers)

Regarding Claim 9, Miller discloses the method of claim 8, and further comprising: changing the driver applied to a function module without changing the application interface. (see Miller col. 14, lines 3-8: forward application layer, multiple functions, specific driver for each function)

Regarding Claim 10, Miller discloses a method of making configuration changes in a telecommunications system, comprising:

- a) defining a plurality of application interfaces, each application interface facilitating communication between a driver set and a function module of the system, wherein each of the application interfaces supports a broadly defined set of operations within a predefined category of operations for a function module; (see

Miller col. 13, line 63 - col. 14, line 10: application functions completed by drivers)

- b) selecting a driver from the driver set for each of the function modules; (see Miller col. 17, line 58 - col. 18, line 8: specific driver for specific function) and
- c) applying the selected driver to its respective function module through its respective application interface. (see Miller col. 18, lines 12-18: application interface to drivers)

Regarding Claim 11, Miller discloses a method of operating telecommunications system, comprising:

- a) defining a plurality of application interfaces, each application interface providing an interface between a driver module and the system; (see Miller col. 18, lines 12-18: interface applications to drivers) and
- b) applying one of a set of drivers to each of the plurality of application interfaces depending upon a predetermined driver need. (see Miller col. 17, line 58 - col. 18, line 8: specific driver for specific function)

Regarding Claim 13, Miller discloses the method of operating a telecommunications system of claim 11, wherein defining further comprises:

- a) generating a set of common instructions for each of the drivers in the set of drivers, the common instructions applicable to each of the drivers of the set of drivers; (see Miller col. 14, lines 34-37: information common to device driver) and

- b) generating a plurality of sets of non-common instructions, a set of non-common instructions for each of the drivers in the set of drivers. (see Miller col. 18, lines 9-18: information specific to particular device driver)

Regarding Claim 16, Miller discloses a method of communicating between a plurality of individual modules in a telecommunications system, comprising:

- a) defining a driver layer containing a plurality of drivers for a plurality of system modules, wherein each of the system modules performs a specific system operation; (see Miller col. 12, lines 39-45: operational modules for applications; modules controlled by drivers)
- b) defining a plurality of application interfaces, an application interface between one of the plurality of drivers in the driver layer of the system and one of the system modules, each application interface defined to support a predetermined set of system functions. (see Miller col. 18, lines 12-18: application interface to drivers)

5. Claims 12, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Parker (US Patent No. 5,822,520).

Regarding Claim 12, Miller discloses a telecommunications system. (see Miller col. 1, lines 7-10: telecommunication system) Miller does not specifically disclose operation of lower layers transparent to higher layer from a user perspective. However, Parker discloses the system of claim 11, wherein applying one of a set of drivers is seamless to

Art Unit: 2143

a user of the system. (see Parker col. 5, lines 27-35; col. 5, lines 40-43: operations in lower (device) layers within ISO model are transparent to higher (application) layer)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miller to perform transparent communications between higher and lower communication protocol layers as taught by Parker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Parker in order to quickly and efficiently generate network packets in the development of network communications tools. (see Parker col. 2, lines 42-46: “ ... *provides a method for quickly and efficiently generating packets ... thereby facilitating the development of network communications tools ...* ”)

Regarding Claim 14, Miller discloses a telecommunications system. (see Miller col. 1, lines 7-10: telecommunication system) for causing a computer to perform a method comprising:

- a) defining a plurality of application interfaces, each application interface providing an interface between a driver module and the system; (see Miller col. 18, lines 12-18: application interface to drivers) and
- b) applying one of a set of drivers to each of the plurality of application interfaces depending upon a predetermined driver need. (see Miller col. 17, line 58 - col. 18, lines 8: specific driver for specific function)

Miller does not specifically disclose the operation of a multiple layered network telecommunications system utilizing a machine readable medium. However, Parker discloses a machine readable medium having machine readable instructions. (see

Parker col. 4, lines 47-64: machine readable medium)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miller to perform transparent communications utilizing machine readable medium between higher and lower communication protocol layers as taught by Parker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Parker in order to quickly and efficiently generate network packets for development network communications tools. (see Parker col. 2, lines 42-46)

Regarding Claim 15, Miller discloses a telecommunications system. (see Miller col. 1, lines 7-10: telecommunication system) Miller does not specifically disclose the operation via a machine readable medium of communications between lower and higher layers being transparent to a user. However, Parker discloses the machine readable medium of claim 14, wherein applying one of a set of drivers is seamless to a user of the system. (see Parker col. 4, lines 47-64; col. 5, lines 27-35; col. 5, lines 40-43: ISO layered communications)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miller to perform transparent communications between higher and lower communication protocol layers as taught by Parker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Parker in order to quickly and efficiently generate network packets for development network communications tools. (see Parker col. 2, lines 42-46)

Art Unit: 2143

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung H Shin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

K H S
Kyung H Shin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS
Jan. 27, 2005

William C. Vaughn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Vaughn, J.